

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended 1, 4, 6-7, 9, and 11-12, canceled claims 5 and 10, and added new claims 13-16. As a result, claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-16 are pending in this application. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, the Office states that Applicants are required to “include a response/acknowledgment of section 1 of the Office Action.” Notice, continuation of 5. Applicants hereby acknowledge that the Office Action indicates that a reference listed on the IDS was placed in the file, but was not considered.

In the Office Action, the Office rejects claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended claim 7 to expressly state that the program product is stored in a computer readable medium. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7-9 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Further, the Office rejects claims 4, 6, 9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In response, Applicants have amended claims 4, 6, 9, and 11-12 to correct the antecedent basis for the claim terms noted by the Office. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 4, 6, 9, and 11-12 as allegedly being indefinite.

Further, the Office rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,448,985 (McNally). In order to maintain a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Office must show that a single reference discloses each feature of the claimed invention. Applicant submits that the Office fails to show that McNally discloses every feature of the claimed invention.

For example, with respect to claim 1, the Office fails to show, *inter alia*, that McNally discloses a window and a section navigator screen as in the claimed invention. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the section navigator screen that was originally claimed in claim 5. In rejecting claim 5, the Office cites FIGS. 3A-B of McNally as allegedly disclosing this feature. As best understood by the Applicants, the Office is referring to directory tree 200 shown in FIGS. 3A-B in particular. Applicants have further amended claim 1 to clarify that the document data includes a plurality of sections and are displayed in a window, which is distinct from the section navigator screen. In sharp contrast, the cited portion of McNally displays a directory tree and contents of a single directory, e.g., “Contents of ‘(C)’”. To this extent, the cited portion of McNally that discusses a scrollable region is limited to the directory tree 200. Applicants submit that this discussion does not apply to a window for displaying a plurality of sections that is distinct from a section navigator screen as in the claimed invention.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-4, 6, and 13-16, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being anticipated by McNally.

With respect to independent claims 7 and 11, Applicants note that the Office presents similar arguments in rejecting these claims as presented with respect to claim 1. Additionally,

Applicants have amended these claims to include similar features as discussed above with respect to claim 1. As a result, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7-9 and 11-12 as allegedly being anticipated by McNally.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the reference used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary and/or in a related patent application, either of which may seek to obtain protection for claims of a potentially broader scope.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the response is compliant and that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John LaBatt/

John W. LaBatt, Reg. No. 48,301
Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile

Dated: 26 July 2007